

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 USC 112 on the grounds that the term "operable" suggestion making an option to perform a given functionality. Applicant has amended the term "operable" to "configured" as suggested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8,10-24 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US 2002/0116541 to Parker. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections but to expedite prosecution with a view to speedy allowance, Applicant has further amended the claims and presents the following discussion illustrating the differences between Parker and the claims as amended. Applicant however reserves the right to reintroduce original claims in a divisional or continuation application.

In the Applicants submission of May 31, 2007, Applicant submitted the following amended claim.

1. [Currently Amended]An electronic device comprising:
at least one output device for emitting a plurality of different signals; and,

a microcomputer for processing *a plurality of events* and *a plurality of applications* such that when one of said applications executes during one of said plurality of events said microcomputer *derives a notification behaviour* from a plurality of notification behaviours based on at least one criterion associated with said one of said plurality of events and instructs said output device to emit one of said signals according to said notification behaviour, said notification behaviour for said one of said plurality of events being determined from a profile selected from a plurality of different profiles; *each of said notification behaviours having a set of identical parameters for each of said applications; each of said notification behaviours being uniquely configurable for each of said applications.*

Applicant previously submitted and, respectfully, continues to submit that the highlighted features are not satisfied by Parker.

Prior to identifying distinguishing features, by way of background Applicant wishes to point out that claim 1 as currently pending refers to both behaviours and profiles, and that these are two separate concepts. The meaning behind these two concepts is defined in the specification. "Behaviours" as used in the specification refers to ways in which notification is actually effected – e.g. audible, via sound, or inaudible via flashing lights. See, for example, the far right column of Table I present application as published in US 2005/0187896. Each "Profile" can give rise to a different notification output for various applications on the device. See, for example, the far left column of Table I and paragraph 60 of the present application as published in US 2005/0187896.

Claim 1 as pending recites the processing of a plurality of events. Support for this recitation is found in Table I and paragraph 60 of the present application, where the plurality of first events is a plurality of calendar appointment; Calendar appointment 104a is associated with the profile quiet 200; whereas calendar appointment 112a is associated with the profile loud 212; profile quiet 200 and profile loud 212 having been described in exemplary format in Table I.

Claim 1 as pending also recites the process of a plurality of applications. Support for this recitation is found in Paragraph 63 and Table I, where the plurality of applications includes a Message Reader Application and an Alarm Application.

Claim 1 as pending also recites that ***each of said notification behaviours having a set of identical parameters for each of said applications.*** Support is found in Table I, in that that the parameters are Type, Tune and Volume for each of the Message Reader and the Daily Alarm.

Claim 1 as pending also recites that ***each of said notification behaviours being uniquely configurable for each of said applications.*** Support is found in Table I, in that the parameters of Type, Tune and Volume are uniquely configurable for each of the Message Reader and the Daily Alarm applications.

Turning now to Parker, the Office Action states the element of "***each of said notification behaviours being uniquely configurable for each of said second events.***" is satisfied by paragraph 3 and paragraph 20 of Parker. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that ***each of said notification behaviours being uniquely configurable for each of said applications***". While Parker does contemplate that a "meeting mode" (See Figure 4, paragraphs 55-57) can be invoked during a calendar event, Parker never teaches or suggests that the meeting mode itself defines notification behaviours that are ***uniquely configurable*** for each of a plurality of applications. Examining Table I of Parker reveals that there is no clear support for "a plurality of second events"; the far right column of Table I in Parker merely lists "Sound, LED and Messages" as notification types. Such notification types in Parker are only analogous to the notification behaviours in Table I of the present application. But paragraph 35 and Table I of Parker does not satisfy the "plurality of applications" element of claim 1; Paragraph 35 of Parker only discusses various types of fixed notification behaviours that accompany a given profile. Figures 5-7 of Parker further illustrates the distinguishing features in Claim 1. Figures 5-7 show a user interface for how the "Meeting" profile is configured; "Volumes", "Sounds" and "Reminders" can be configured in the profile, but these notification behaviours are fixed for ALL applications that may execute while the meeting profile is being invoked.

While Applicant respectfully submits that at least the foregoing is sufficient to patentably distinguish over Parker, Applicant also respectfully submits that the element of ***each of said notification behaviours having a set of identical parameters for each of said applications*** is not satisfied by Parker. The Office Action at the top of page 4 made reference to Figure 4; Table 1 and Paragraph 35 relative to this element. With regard to Figure 4, Paragraph 55-57 of Parker provides a specific example of how method 900 of

Figure 4 can operate. However, as previously discussed there is no reference in Parker to setting different notifications for different applications. Therefore, Parker cannot satisfy the element of providing identical sets of parameters for each of the applications.

The features discussed in relation to amended claim 1 are now incorporated into the other independent claims and accordingly those independent claims likewise now distinguish over Parker. Applicant respectfully submits that since the independent claims are now deemed allowable so too should the dependent claims be deemed allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that it has fully responded to the Examiner's concerns and that the claims are now in condition for immediate allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Applicants hereby request that any fee which may be required for the papers being filed with this letter be charged to, or any overpayment be credited to, Account No. 50-3750.

Appl. No. 10/784,979
Amdt. date November 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 13, 2007

In the event that any PTO official wishes to discuss this application on the telephone, the call should be directed to the undersigned at 416-920-8170 x 109.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
T. Andrew Currier

T. Andrew Currier
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 45,400

Perry + Currier
1300 Yonge Street, Suite 500
Toronto, Ontario
Canada, M4T 1X3
Tel: 416.920.8170
Fax: 416.920.1350